

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 55.—No. 7.] LONDON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 13, 1825. [Price 1s.

## A TIMELY WARNING TO THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND:

*On the conduct of Mr. O'Connell,  
and on the dangers to be appre-  
hended from his future pro-  
ceedings.*

Kensington, August 9, 1825.

CATHOLICS OF IRELAND,

YOUR history, for nearly three hundred years last past, presents the world with an almost unbroken series of oppressions, inflicted, nominally and ostensibly, by England; but, in nearly every case, arising from the want of steadiness, if not from the want of something still more essential, in your own native pretended friends, in whom you have, at various times, confided; and, which is still more mortifying, in whom you have, almost invariably, continued

to confide, long and long after their utter incapacity, or utter want of sincerity, their utter unworthiness of confidence, has become manifest to all the world, yourselves only excepted. *Gratitude* is, in its nature, most laudable; but, whether any particular instance of it be praiseworthy, or otherwise, must depend on the object of it. For my part, I am disgusted, when I hear of your *gratitude* to the memory of GRATTAN, who served you at one time, whom you most *amply paid* for that service; but who was afterwards the *author*, the actual drawer-up of that law, which shuts you up in your houses from sun-set to sunrise, and which has transported hundreds of you to *Botany Bay* without trial by jury!

When people are so indiscriminating in their gratitude, they in-

N

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

*vile betrayers*; they present an easy prey to the selfishly ambitious. When people are to be dazzled, blinded, and made the tools of intriguers merely by volumes of *big talk*, they are, and they must be, without means of defence against powerful oppressors. Such a people are, in fact, without a *head*; without any thing that can ever make them formidable to their oppressors. They are a flock, always confiding in, always grateful towards, their dogs, and always, when the interest of the latter demand it, given up to the wolf.

Such has been the case with regard to you from the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth to the present day, and even to the present hour. Had it not been for this, Ireland never could have been in the horribly degraded state in which it now is. Had you judiciously placed your confidence, had your confidence and gratitude been confined to objects worthy of them; had betrayers and vain pretenders felt the due

weight of your scorn, you, with the highly-favoured country that you inhabit, with your great aptitude to cheerful labour, with quickness of perception and facility of communicating thought, with military bravery joined to great bodily strength, by all which you are eminently distinguished, never could have been, for so many ages, kept in abject subjection and stark beggary by a mere handful of aliens to your soil and protesters against that religion to which you have so faithfully adhered.

Many and many have been the occasions, when circumstances tendered you deliverance from your degrading yoke; when just men in England were ready to co-operate in your cause; when every thing seemed to promise a termination of your long, long endured calamities. But, invariably, on every occasion like this, some selfish intrigue, some crooked proceeding, some devious course, some underhand play, on the part of those in whom you confided,

has come to dishearten and disgust your real friends, to assist your real enemies, and to throw back your cause for an indefinite period; and, what has been more mortifying even than such a result from such causes, you have *still confided*; you have persevered in *gratitude*, when you ought to have replaced it by reproach and contempt; you have acted the part of that description of lovers, with whom having been jilted, operates as an incentive to augmented love, and produces constancy that ceases only with the life of the lover.

Whether you will, or will not, *now* (for, perhaps, the hundredth time) act this part over again, by still confiding in Mr. O'CONNELL, his true and trusty "Counsellor" BRIC, and others of pretty nearly equal judgment and equal modesty and fidelity, is more than I can say. But, on this I am resolved; namely, that, if you do now act this part over again, it shall be *with your eyes open*. I possess the means of laying before you

facts and reasons sufficient to induce you to avoid a course so disgraceful to your intellects, and so injurious to your interests; to lay them fully before you is a duty that I owe to truth, to justice, to Ireland, and to England; and this duty I am now about to perform.

Before I proceed further, let me brush away a little *nonsense* that the partisans of Mr. O'CONNELL have not been ashamed to put forth, in consequence of my address to you on this subject. This nonsense consists in repeating the old cookoo cry of "*inconsistency*," raised formerly, on this side of the water, by the admirers of BURDETT'S many acres. I had praised him, called on my readers for *confidence in him*, when he was really supporting the cause of reform, and was, in point of fortune and of weight, at the head of those, who sought to obtain an extension of the elective franchise, and when he was representing the two factions in parliament as "*one regiment*," serving against

the people ; but, when, in 1817, he basely abandoned the *poor* reformers, whom he had *urged on*, and urged on, too, against my wish in point of time ; when he joined that same "*regiment* ;" was I still to praise him ; still to call on the people to confide in him ? And was it to be "*inconsistent*" to stick to the cause of reform, and abandon and censure a renegado from it ? Those base persons, who stuck to the man of *many acres*, set up the cry of "*inconsistency* ;" but, these persons were soon reduced to a miserable "*Rump*," of whom, and whom only, BURDETT is now the representative. And, surely, it must be a miserable Irish Rump, who can join the "*Freeman's Journal*" in accusing me of "*changing sides*," because I now condemn in Mr. O'CONNELL that departure from the path of rectitude, which departure he *condemns in himself*.

As to *private interest*, I cannot possibly have any in taking the part that I am now taking. I am

not in Ireland ; I cannot be the rival of Mr. O'Connell ; to pull him down cannot, in any way, raise me ; he is not my rival in any way ; my writings on the side of the Catholics, in general, cannot be made *more profitable* to me by my displeasing (as I certainly must) that part of them whose obstinate blindness still makes them his slavish followers and willing dupes : in short, I may safely defy any man breathing to point out one single private advantage, of any sort whatever, that I can, even by possibility, derive from the course that I am pursuing. I have never experienced any affront, nor even any slight, at the hands of Mr. O'CONNELL. All his intercourse with me, from first to last, has been marked by every thing bespeaking friendship and respect for me, friendship and respect on which I set the highest value ; and, as to his public declarations respecting me, is there a man on earth who could be insensible to them ? Let him who can, then, suggest any



possible motive for what I am now doing, other than that sense of duty, which ought, in such a case, to set aside all considerations of a private nature.

If, too, it were only the *past* that I had to contemplate, there might, and there would, be a reason for my keeping silence at present upon these subjects. But, the *future* stares me in the face. Having seen *one Association* end in an addition to the *criminal code* of ill-fated and ill-treated Ireland; having seen it, after a most boisterous life, expire as quietly as a fish, its leaders having, as it were in atonement for its evanescent virtues, assented to surrender a large part of the political rights, and all the purity of the religion, of those to defend and preserve whose rights of all sorts the Association was professedly formed: having seen these things, I may well fear, that *another Association* will lead to results not less mischievous and disgraceful, especially when I behold *the same identical leaders*

*at work*, at work, too, in precisely the same manner, preparing another scene, whereby again to disgust all rational, sober and sincere men, again to make your friends hang their heads, again to ensure a new cause of exultation to your enemies.

I have, in my former Address, given the reasons why I think, that this new Association can do *no good*. The naked fact, however, is this: that it is a creature of Mr. O'CONNELL, who intends it as the means of putting forth praises on himself; as the means of constantly keeping him before the public in newspaper columns; and, more especially, as the means of browbeating into *silence*, at least, that large part of the sense and integrity of Ireland, which, as he well knows, his late conduct has placed in a state of hostility against him. The King's declaration (through the Duke of York), the speeches of Lords Liverpool and Eldon, the consequent great hostile majority in the House of Lords, sanctioned, too, by real

*public approbation*; these, which would seem to have affixed the seal of never-ending exclusion; these, and we all know it, and Mr. O'CONNELL now knows it himself, were *wholly his own work*, carried on, as to a part of the details of it, by the skilful and accomplished "Counsellor" BRIC, whose luminous and profound *paragraphs*, written in London and published in Dublin, ought to immortalize that "*learned gentleman*."

Mr. O'CONNELL knows well, that this effect, so disastrous to the Catholics, was his own work, and, what is more, he knows, that all men of any information as to such matters, *know it too*. He knows well enough, that the *good sense*, the *sober reason*, the *integrity* and *real piety*, of Ireland, are against him; and he means to stun them and frighten them all into *silence*, by the means of his *new Association*, in which he has for distinguished fellow-labourers, the *solid* "Counsellor" BRIC and the "*super-human*" Mr. SHIEL.

Of this *browbeating* plan we had a pretty complete specimen in the transactions at the parish chapel of SAINT AUDEON (not St. Andrew, as my printer, by mistake, gave it), Dublin, of which I spoke in my last Address to you, and of which I shall have to speak again by-and-by. Here the Catholics were met in their *parish chapel*, to discuss matters relating to the late transactions as to the "*wings*"; or, so, at least, Mr. O'CONNELL understood. They proposed to enter into some *resolutions* on the subject. What business had Mr. O'CONNELL there? What business had Mr. "Counsellor" BRIC in that chapel upon that occasion? We shall, by-and-by, see what they did there as to *uttering assertions* and *making reports* of those assertions. But, what business had they there *at all*? The "Counsellor" went in as a "*reporter*"; his presence was objected to by some; but, he did *not retire*; at last, the parishioners agreed to let him stay. Quickly afterwards Mr. O'CONNELL ap-

pears in the gallery, and begins to harangue, and, very soon, to browbeat! Was this *delicate*, when his deeds were to be the subject of examination and discussion? Was it decent? Did it discover either a love of free discussion, or a consciousness of having acted well? In short, this was an attempt to do, with regard to this one parish, that which he intends to do, with regard to all Ireland, by means of his *new Association*; namely, to beat down into complete silent acquiescence, all the sober sense and integrity of the country, and to ride triumphant on the shoulders of the thoughtless and the noisy, a perfect Irish Bacchus astride a tub of whiskey.

And, is Ireland to be treated in this way? Is Mr. O'CONNELL, even after he has confessed himself to have been a dupe, and to have done that which has "*retarded emancipation*;" is he, even after this, to be suffered to roam about the country, boasting of his long *services* and *great sacrifices*,

and carrying, in appearance, all the brains and all the virtues of Ireland about in his pocket? what a reflection on the sense and spirit of Irishmen! Are they made of stuff to be treated thus? Have none of them but himself any of that "*intellect*," of which, according to himself, he possesses such prodigious quantities? I confess, that it is too much the fashion in Ireland to set a value greatly too high on the faculty of *uttering words with volubility*. But, can Ireland produce *nothing but this*? I have known Irishmen, and I have the pleasure to know them yet, as much distinguished by solid sense, powers of nice discrimination, sound principle, strict veracity and integrity, scorn of shuffle and trick, modesty and fair-play, as any men that I have ever met with in the whole course of my life; and I cannot without indignation inexpressible see a settled plan for bullying such men into silence by such people as Mr. O'CONNELL and "*Counsellor*," BRIC.

It is my wish to prevent the success of this noisy and brow-beating scheme; and it appears to me, that the way most likely to effect my purpose is, first of all, to give a *plain statement of facts*, relating to the conduct of Mr. O'CONNELL, respecting the Catholic cause, while he was in England; next, to give *as plain a statement of facts*, relative to his conduct, respecting the same cause, since his return to Ireland, as far as an account of that conduct has come to my hands; and, lastly, to make (or to make them as I proceed) such remarks on that conduct, as the facts seem to me to call for.

Mr. O'CONNELL was *deceived* in England: he was, in fact, the *dupe* of men far more clever and cunning, and of much greater experience, than himself. But, had he no *warning*? Did he fall into their snares *blindfolded*? You shall hear. He came to London on, I believe, the 18th of February: at any rate, I saw him for the first time after his arrival, on

the 19th. I could not see him one moment without warning him of his danger. But, it was lateish in the evening (Saturday), and I was so anxious to guard him against the machinations of the enemy, that I wrote to him most pressinglly to come to me the next day, and *before he saw* any of the "*able friends*," as Mr. BUTLER called them. I did not see him till the afternoon of the 20th, when I addressed him in words very nearly like these: "I hope Sir, that you are aware, that you are come into *hell*, and, of course, that you have devils to deal with." I then proceeded to tell him, how they would go to work to seduce him; to tell him, that, seeing that he was a man not to be *crushed outright*, and not to be corrupted by *vulgar* means, they would proceed by *blandishments*, by *flattery*, by *dinners*, by *amazing condescension*, by affecting to look upon him as the *eighth wonder of the world*; that they would, by such means, get him to *commit himself*



in one way or another; and that if they succeeded in this, they would send him back to Ireland, *bereft of the power of ever being formidable to them again.* I besought him to be, in all his intercourse with enemies, *full of expressions of the bitterest resentment,* and, with the "*able friends,*" to adhere inflexibly to a resolution to *give up nothing, except from actual compulsion.* How often must he have thought of this, since the disappointment of his hopes!

On the 26th of February, he made his speech at the *Freemasons' Tavern.* That speech made him friends and admirers throughout England. That speech, if he had *stopped there,* would have made him just what he ought to have been. A French gentleman applied to me for a note of introduction to Mr. O'CONNELL to correct the speech, previous to a translation into French. The speech was translated, printed, and sent off to Paris, and that, too, at the sole expense of the

translator himself, to whom Mr. O'CONNELL expressed great satisfaction at his intention; and, when he saw the translation, he was, as the translator told me, delighted with it.

But, the next day, the 27th Mr. O'CONNELL DINED at Mr BROUGHAM's, placed between the Dukes of Devonshire and Leinster, and having the Duke of Sussex opposite him.

On the 2d of March he had his first interview with Mr. PLUNKETT, as mentioned in my last address to you, the history of which I must here repeat again. PLUNKETT, on the 1st of March, came up to him, under the gallery in the House of Commons (where he was sitting with others of the Deputies, hearing the debate on the Bill to suppress the Association), and said: "How do you do, O'CONNELL? You sent me word that you wanted to see me." "Yes, I want to speak to you about a matter of *private professional business.*" PLUNKETT said he would go to O'Con-

nell's hotel; but the other preferred PLUNKETT's house. To that house he went *alone*. The next day (the 3d of March) he returned to PLUNKETT's, taking Lord KILLEEN with him. After this second interview, he and this young Lord went (whether that same day, or not, I do not know) to the Deputation, and Mr. O'CONNELL announced to the Deputation, that the "*wings*" had been proposed to them. Some one or more of the Deputies said, "Did you *assent* to them?" "Yes," said Mr. O'CONNELL; but, Lord KILLEEN said, "*I did not assent.*"

On the same 2d of March, in the afternoon, Mr. O'CONNELL called upon me at Kensington. He had *just left Plunkett*. He told me, that PLUNKETT was the warm friend of the Catholics, which *surprised* me much, and *alarmed me more*. I, therefore, took occasion again to beseech him to be *on his guard*. I omitted to urge nothing that my mind could suggest, in order to induce him to be careful to say

and do nothing that could possibly be made a handle of to his prejudice.

On the 5th of March (three days later), Mr. LAWLESS and "Counsellor" BRIC called on me, and told me of the "*wings*"! I was quite confounded; and not the less confounded, when I reflected, that Mr. O'CONNELL had been with me on the 2d (after he had had his first interview with PLUNKETT), and had said nothing to me about any "*wings*." Yet, they must have talked of those wings on that very day, before he saw me. It occurred to me, instantly, that the object of his visit to me, on the 2d, had been to sound me on the subject of those propositions, and to see how far I might be reconciled to them; but that, finding me alarmed at the bare idea of his having an intercourse so close with his very recent prosecutor, and who was also the unsparing advocate of the established church, he had gone away without mentioning the matter to me. Mr. LAWLESS and "Coun-

sellor" BRIC were precisely opposite in their opinions about the "wings"; and, in spite of the "*eloquence*" of the latter, and his description of the state of the 40s. freeholders, I, at once, declared myself of opinion with Mr. LAWLESS; and, moreover, did every thing in my power to convince Mr. BRIC, that, in the first place, no Emancipation Bill would pass, at this time, let the sacrifices be what they might, unless the Bill still excluded Catholics from Parliament; that, in the next place, if such sacrifices were assented to by the Deputation, the assent would *add to the majority* against the Bill; and, which would be a still more fatal consequence, the rejection of the Bill would be a *most popular measure*, and would become an object of anxious desire on the part of the real friends of Ireland, and on the part of no one more than on my part: and, lastly, that, if this assent were given by Mr. O'CONNELL, he would not only return home *defeated*, but also *disgraced*. In

conclusion, I requested Mr. BART to communicate to Mr. O'CONNELL my sentiments on the subject.

On the 8th of March, Mr. O'CONNELL came to Kensington, along with Mr. BRIC and Mr. TERRY. The object of the visit undoubtedly was to hear what I would say, upon the subject of the "*wings*," to Mr. O'CONNELL's face. He (who, observe, had written his first letter to the Association *the day before*) entered into an *explanation* of the matter. Observe, that this was on a *Tuesday*, and, on the *next Saturday*; it was pretty certain, that I should not be *silent* on the subject. I had expressed myself in very decided terms, on the 5th, to Messrs. LAWLESS and BRIC. Mr. O'CONNELL, though he had thought proper to listen to the advice of BURDETT (and his many acres) instead of mine (without any acres), still had, as I thought, some misgivings in his mind; some apprehensions, that my open and decided hostility to the "*wings*" (a

name that wise and energetic Burdett gave them) might, perchance, clip them a little. To his desire to blunt the edge of this dangerous scissors, I ascribed this visit; and to it also I ascribed the very unnecessary presence, upon such an occasion, of Mr. "Counsellor" BRIC. And, how did I act now? Did I suppress to Mr. O'CONNELL's face, thoughts to which I had given utterance behind his back? No: but, I went far beyond what Mr. BRIC had heard me say on the 5th. Having heard his "explanation" of what it was, in my mind, impossible to mitigate, I said, in nearly these very words: "My opinion, as to these measures, remains unaltered; but, my opinion is nothing compared with the opinion of the people of England. I impute no corrupt motive to you; but, it is not what I impute; it is what the public will impute. It matters, in the present case, not a straw what IS; but, it matters every thing what the middle class of the people here will THINK; and they, who, like women, do not stop to split hairs in their reasoning, but take obvious facts, and push on at once to a conclusion, will THINK, that you have offered to sell

*"your country for a silk gown;*  
*"and, if they once think this, all the talking and all the writing in the world will never get that opinion out of their heads."* I have put these words within marks of quotation, because they are still fresh in my memory, and are, as nearly as possible, the very words that I uttered. It gave me great pain to utter them, and, if it gave Mr. O'CONNELL pain to hear them, he had to thank for it the presence of Mr. BRIC, who manifestly came to hear whether I would repeat, in the presence of Mr. O'CONNELL, what I had said on the 5th, and who now heard me say that to Mr. O'CONNELL's face, that which no man had ever, or has ever, heard me say behind his back, except in the relating of what I had said to his face. I did not neglect this occasion to warn him again of his danger. I assured him, in the most positive manner, that, on no conditions whatever would any *Emancipation Bill* pass, and that, therefore, all offer of concessions was a pure *perte*, so much actually thrown away; and, which was still worse, so much done to make the public, here at least, wish for the rejection of the Bill. I did not say this without giving my reasons for what I said. The gentle-



men went away with hearing my expressions of anxious hope, that Mr. O'CONNELL would *withdraw his assent*, if he had given it, to the hateful propositions in question. Alas! I did not then know, that he had, **THE DAY BEFORE**, written his first letter to the Association, announcing the "*wings*," defending them, praising Plunkett, calling on Ireland (poor deceived Ireland!) to be *grateful* to BURDETT, and enjoining on the Society, and, indeed, on all Ireland, to be as mute as fishes, until he, their only legitimate mouthpiece, should return.

On the 10th of March (two days after the above interview), a good part (seventeen, I think) of the Deputies dined at my house at Kensington. I knew that there were differences of opinion amongst them. Mr. O'CONNELL was not one of the party; and, I was particularly desirous, that nothing should be said about his conduct. Yet, having all these gentlemen at the same table with me, it was difficult to be silent upon the subject; and I hate reserve and silence and secrecy as much as Irishmen themselves do. This was on the *Thursday*. I had written my Register for the *next Saturday*; and, in order to be fair and open, and to avoid all possi-

bility of a presumption, that I had invited these gentlemen to dine for the purpose of fishing out their thoughts, and availing myself of them; I told them, that I had written my Register for the next Saturday; that it treated of the "*wings*;" that I had the proof-sheets of it in the house; that I would, if they chose, *read these to them*; that I begged them *not to say what they thought of it*; that they would oblige me much if they would, for this evening, abstain from expressing any opinion at all on this subject; and that nothing might be said, which was not be looked upon as said at Charing-Cross. To keep *seventeen Irishmen and one Frenchman* (the gentleman that had translated Mr. O'Connell's speech) *silent*, especially with a host who did not yield to the best of them in a propensity to talk, or in force of lungs, was a difficult matter indeed. However, with this understanding, I read the Register of the 12th of March, which concluded with these words: "However, be assured, that such a project will end in nothing but the *indelible disgrace of the projectors*. Such an outrage on all law and justice: such an abomination will not take place. If the measure were to be followed to a certain

“ extent, it would be stopped in  
 “ its progress. If coupled with  
 “ any thing called Catholic Eman-  
 “ cipation, it would form the fair-  
 “ est possible ground for rejecting  
 “ that Emancipation altogether ;  
 “ and it seems impossible to be-  
 “ lieve that it could be coupled  
 “ with any measure for the relief  
 “ of the Catholics, except with a  
 “ settled design of refusing that  
 “ relief, and, observe, *refusing it*  
 “ *too, with the hearty approba-*  
 “ *tion of every good man in the*  
 “ *kingdom.*” Thus were all these  
 gentlemen, the moment I could  
 apprize them, and two days before  
 the public could be so apprized,  
 in full possession of the part  
 which I had taken on the subject,  
 and which I had taken, too, of my  
 own accord, and without any com-  
 munication with any of them.  
 When I had done reading, I gave  
 the proof-sheets to a gentleman  
 who sat near me, requesting him  
 to give them to Mr. O’CONNELL  
 the next morning, in order that he  
 might, if he should think it worth  
 his while, be prepared, to coun-  
 teract its effects, whatever those  
 might appear likely to be. After  
 this we spent a very pleasant  
 evening. It was my birth-day ;  
 I was fairly getting over a long  
 and teasing complaint proceeding  
 from a cold caught in the July

before ; all my children at home  
 and all well ; and my wife, with  
 sons as tall as their father, taken  
 by these blades for my daughter.  
 So that, these blackguard “ wings”  
 aside, I have rarely spent so  
 happy a day in the whole course  
 of my life, though more happy  
 days, than those that I have spent,  
 have seldom fallen to the lot of  
 man.

On this same day Mr. SHIEL told  
 me, speaking of the advantages  
 that would arise from “ Emanci-  
 pation,” that Mr. O’CONNELL  
 had been assured, that he should  
 have a *patent of precedency* ; that  
 is to say, that the King would grant  
 him a patent, putting him in that  
 place of forwardness at the Bar,  
 in which place he would have  
 been, *if he had always been a*  
*Protestant.* This was not said  
 at all in the way of insinuation  
 against Mr. O’CONNELL ; but the  
 thing was cited as a proof of the  
*friendly and conciliating dispo-*  
*sition of the Government* ; and  
 certainly it would have been no  
 more than Mr. O’CONNELL’s due.  
 But, the misfortune is, that the  
 assurance of it came in bad com-  
 pany ; it came in company with  
 Mr. O’CONNELL’s assent to the  
 “ wings” ; those “ wings”, which,  
 as he told the Society, “ many  
 “ gentlemen, connected with the

"Government," *wished for*; those "wings" which he so strenuously advocated in March; those "wings" which he *now* abandons, and of which he *pledges himself* never again to be the advocate, and never to assent to; just as the girl so solemnly promised never to lose her chastity a second time, if they would but forgive her for *this once*. "Yes, my dear," said the father, "I forgive you with all my soul; but, while I abhor and execrate your crafty seducer, it is my duty to keep you at home, and not to expose so weak a vessel to temptation again."

This promise of a *patent of precedence* is a matter of very great importance, when considered in connexion with Mr. O'CONNELL's conduct in assenting to and in urging the Irish people to assent to the "wings"; and, therefore, I shall quote a passage from Mr. SHIEL's evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons, in which an instrument of this sort was mentioned. His words were these:—"The omission to raise a Roman Catholic of high merit to the rank of *King's Counsel* is an individual wrong, it throws him back in his profession, *touches his pecuniary interest*, places his infe-

riors in acquirement above his head, and wounds his honourable pride."—Then he was asked: "There is a power of granting a *Patent of Precedency* to a Roman Catholic?"—Answer: "Yes; but it is *never exercised*."

Now, mark; this examination of Mr. SHIEL took place on the 3d of March. On the 2nd of March, (only the day before,) Mr. O'CONNELL had had his first interview with PLUNKETT, the "sincere" friend of the Catholics. On the 7th of March, Mr. O'CONNELL wrote his first letter to the Association, defending the "wings," and pledging himself for the *sincerity* of Plunkett. On the 10th of March, Mr. SHIEL told me, that the *promise of a Patent of Precedency* had been made to Mr. O'CONNELL.

Is there a man upon earth who can want more than these facts to account for the whole of the conduct of Mr. O'CONNELL, while in England? Comment on these facts, if addressed to men of sense and sincerity, must be impertinent: to fools, or to the false men, the facts themselves, and even a judicial proof of their truth, would be useless. However, let me say this; that, though, as Mr. SHIEL stated, a *patent of precedence* was a matter of "*pecuniary interest*,"

I do not impute this species of vulgar corruption to Mr. O'CONNELL. I impute to him *inordinate vanity*, vanity greater than my pen can paint. He wished to be high at the Bar; but, the great bait was, a *seat in parliament*, of which he was *sure*, if the Emancipation Bill passed. His love of everlasting speech-making, his desire to be continually hearing the sound of his own voice, his thinking that talk, and nothing but talk, is valuable; this, which grows, at last, into a sort of disease, and which disease is very epidemic in Ireland, where, unhappily for that country, men are but too generally estimated by their *words* rather than by their *deeds*; this disease appears to have corroded his whole mind. He seems to think, that the making of speeches is the only thing worth attending to; that speech-makers are the only men to be held in honour, and that he is the first of all speech-makers.

But, while I unreluctantly, and in the most ample terms, acquit him of all *basely corrupt* motive; while I ascribe his mischievous assent, and his more than marvellous credulity, to the suggestions of his unparalleled vanity; while I am ready to allow, that it was weakness and not wickedness,

that led him to do that, which he now acknowledges to have been injurious to the Catholic cause; while I do this, I must not omit to insist, that, so that the *mischief be done*, it is no matter to the sufferers, whether it proceed from the weakness or the wickedness, the vanity or the corruption, of the doer of that mischief; and that whether vain or corrupt, he is equally unfitted for future trust and confidence as a leader in the conducting of the affairs of the same cause.

Nevertheless, I should have been willing to keep silence as to the past, if his conduct, *after his return to Ireland*, had been marked, I will not say by *modesty* (that was out of the question), but by an *absence of arrogance*, or, even by an absence of *insolence*; and towards those, too, before whom he ought to have considered himself as standing in the character and attitude of a political penitent, beseeching pardon for having obstinately persevered, even to the last, in rejecting their advice and their earnest and most friendly and most kind entreaties. In one of those "Addresses," which, after his return, he put forth to the Catholics of Ireland, and which Address shows (by-the-by) the vast difference



between the pouring forth of frothy noise from the mouth and putting sense upon paper; in one of those Addresses, he talks of "the under-growl of poor JACK LAWLESS and his FOOLISH associates." He clearly means Mr. LAWLESS's associates in opposing the "wings;" from whom he has the justice not to except ME, I having, as to this matter, been a constant and well-known "associate" of Mr. LAWLESS, from first to last.

The term "*under-growl*" is, to be sure (besides its elegance) peculiarly well applied to attacks like that of Mr. LAWLESS, which were open, public, distinct, loud, and always *aboveboard*; peculiarly well applied to a line of conduct, never keeping, for one moment, a thought secret from Mr. O'CONNELL himself. And, was mine, the first associate of Mr. Lawless, an "*under-growl*"? Look at that conduct of mine, of the whole of which, as to this affair, I have, above, given you a full account. I disguised no thought of mine from Mr. O'CONNELL, from first to last. All my thoughts, touching the wings, went into print. I never said of Mr. O'CONNELL, or his conduct, any thing that was not openly said; and, the very hardest thing

I ever said of him, was said to his face, and in the presence of his own friends.

But, besides this *unpardonable* arrogance and insolence; besides his having now started in a new career of delusion, supported on the one side by the "*super-human* eloquence" of his friend, Mr. SHIEL (whose "*evidence*" I may, another time, show to have savoured but too strongly of human frailty), and, on the other side, by "Counsellor" BRIG, whose renowned *paragraphs* have proved to be any thing but *prophetic*, and whose "*reports*" we shall find Mr. O'CONNELL himself driven to accuse of falsehood; besides the senseless abuse which he is now pouring forth upon *those very persons*, whom, in his letter of the 7th of March (while the patent of precedence was strong in his nose), he assured the late Association were "*much better men*" "than their *passions* allowed them to believe;" besides making, as far as he is able, the whole of the Catholics of Ireland parties to this abuse, heaped on all the Ministers, not excepting that very Mr. PEEL, to whom, in the soft moments of the patent-hope, he sent, as I have been informed, a letter of reconciliation, which Mr. PEEL never answered; and,

if I have been wrongly informed, Mr. O'CONNELL can distinctly state that he never did such a thing, *I believing the fact most firmly*, and my readers believing it too, until it be contradicted by something other than that "*laugh*," which he says he will bestow on me, when he shall have the "*leisure*": besides his most gross and even brutal abuse on the SOLICITOR GENERAL, on Mr. BANKES, Mr. BRIGHT and Sir THOMAS LETHERIDGE, all of whom acted in an open, manly, consistent manner, but particularly offensive to him, because they spoke with disdain of the compromise which was to sacrifice the franchises of the Irish freeholders for the sake of the silk gowns; besides this mischievous virulence, which, if it came from the *leader*, must be ascribed to the whole body of Irish Catholics: besides these things; besides "*the ASSOCIATION - BUTTON*," and all the innumerable fooleries and mob-traps now setting, and mob-diverting tricks now playing off: besides these, there is that instance of monstrous *audacity*, the endeavour to shift all the blame of the "*wings*" from his own shoulders, and to lay them on those of the *two Catholic Bishops*; and, then (when called to account by Mr.

KINSELLA) that instance of monstrous *meanness*, in endeavouring to shift the blame of his speech from his own shoulders to those of "*the newspaper reporters*," seeming to forget that his reporter, upon this occasion, was a personage of no less consequence than "*Counsellor*" BRIC himself!

As to the charge against Doctors DOYLE and MURRAY, I spoke of it in my last address to you; and in my Register of the 30th July I inserted the letter of Mr. KINSELLA (Dr. Doyle's curate at Carlow), completely defending those prelates against that most false, foul, and injurious charge. But, I wish my readers to have all these documents under their eye at one and the same time. I will, therefore, now insert, first, the charge of Mr. O'CONNELL against the Bishops, as contained in his speech from the gallery of the Chapel of the parish of St. AUDEON, Dublin; next Mr. KINSELLA's first letter; next Mr. O'CONNELL's answer to that letter; and, last, Mr. KINSELLA's second letter. You, in Ireland, have read all these; but, my English readers have not; and, therefore, I thus make a collection of them, begging my readers to go through them all with attention.

EXTRACT FROM MR. O'CONNELL'S SPEECH AT ST. AUDEON'S CHAPEL.

I saw that there was a prospect of achieving the liberty of Ireland, by means at which, under other circumstances, and if *acting only upon my own judgment*, I should have shuddered with horror. But I did not rest on my own authority—I was in communication with two Prelates, who are the ornaments of Ireland—Dr. Doyle and Dr. Murray. Can I offer a better plea than when I say that *I did nothing, said nothing*, that had not their entire concurrence and sanction (CHEERS). Is there in the universal Catholic Church a Prelate on whose purity the Catholics of Ireland could rest with more unqualified confidence than Dr. Murray's? I shall content myself with saying, that *no act was done, nor any word spoken by me*, that had not the stamp of their approbation. . . . . With regard to the measure affecting the freeholders, I am sensible that that has been injurious, and has retarded our progress. I know that it has been rather a dead weight to impede us, than a wing to help us on; and no man is more ready to condemn its effect, or deplore its introduction, than I am; and accordingly my friend, Mr. M'Loughlin, has, at this moment, in his pocket, a portion of the Report of the Committee of twenty-one, *condemnatory of the introduction of that measure*, because it has *retarded our cause* (Cheers). I am conscious that it has done us a disservice, and therefore I shall be the first to oppose its reintroduction, if it should be attempted at any future time (Cheers). This I am resolved upon, and I am also determined to persevere in the line of conduct I have already adopted, namely, *to do nothing that shall not be recommended to me by the sanction of the Clergy, the watchful guardians of our faith*. On them we may rely with confidence for the preservation of the purity of our

sacred religion. *They may have been taken by surprise*. The purity of their own motives, and the consciousness of their own integrity, may have exposed them to the artifices of designing persons; but the period will never again arrive, when they will be unprepared for any measure that the Government may propose. In them I will confide; on their sleeves I will pin my faith.

MR. KINSELLA'S FIRST LETTER.

TO THE EDITOR.

Carlton, July 14th, 1825.

It was late on yesterday when I read in your Paper a Report of the Proceedings at the Meeting of St. Audeon's. There are some statements in a speech attributed to Mr. O'Connell at that Meeting, which have filled me with great astonishment, and very sincere regret. I am surprised that Mr. O'Connell should have stated, even inadvertently, what must be inaccurate; and I am grieved that the character of my revered Prelate compels me to point out the inaccuracy of Mr. O'Connell's statement. There is no one in the country more convinced than I am of Mr. O'Connell's powerful talents, incorruptible honesty, and highly important services; there is no one in Ireland more aware of the necessity of preserving the most perfect unanimity in the Catholic body; and, most certainly, nothing less than an object of paramount importance could have induced me to point out an error (as it appears to me) in a man of so much importance to the cause of his country. However, Sir, the character of two most distinguished Prelates is also in question; and I am perfectly convinced that our cause would suffer much more deeply by leaving the breath of suspicion on their spotless reputation, than by pointing out what must have been a mistake on the part of Mr. O'Connell.

In my remarks on this disagreea-

ble subject, I shall confine myself entirely to the conduct of Doctor Doyle; for though I do most firmly believe, that Dr. Murray and he acted throughout precisely in the same manner, still I have not an absolute certainty of each particular in Doctor Murray's conduct, and I am fully determined to state nothing but what I know to be the fact.

There are, in Mr. O'Connell's speech, two statements on which I wish to observe. The first is contained in the following words: 'I saw that there was a prospect of achieving the liberty of Ireland, by means, at which, under other circumstances, and if acting only upon my own judgment, I should have shuddered with horror. But I did not rest on my own authority; I was in communication with two Prelates, who are the ornaments of Ireland—Doctor Doyle and Doctor Murray. Can I offer a better plea than when I say that I did nothing, said nothing, which had not their entire concurrence and sanction.' Now, Sir, at the meeting in Bridge-street, the whole question at issue was, the propriety of Mr. O'Connell's conduct, in approving of the Bill for increasing the qualifications of Electors, and of the proposed plan for pensioning the Catholic Clergy. If, then, I understand him rightly, he means to say that his reason for laying aside his horror for these Bills was, that they had been sanctioned by the Catholic Prelates, and that it was in consequence of his communications with the Bishops that his approbation had been given. If such be his meaning, he labours under a great mistake; and in pointing out his error to himself and the public, I shall rest upon the authority of dates and documents, which every one can verify.

Dr. Doyle left Carlow on the 7th of last March, in order to proceed to England, and until after that period, he was totally ignorant that it was intended to add 'Wings' to the Catholic Bill. He and Doctor Mur-

ray arrived in London on the 13th of March, and previous to that time he had held no communication whatever with Mr. O'Connell. Now Sir, I beg your attention to the dates. On the 7th of March (the very day on which Dr. Doyle left Carlow) Mr. O'Connell addressed a letter to the Catholic Association, and in that letter he mentions both the obnoxious measures in terms of approbation. I do not blame him for approving of what he certainly thought right, but I think he will himself perceive that he was mistaken in saying that his approval was the result of a communication with Dr. Doyle.

Mr. O'Connell's examinations before the Committees of Parliament took place on the 25th of February, and on the 1st, 4th, and 11th of March, and they had entirely terminated before the arrival of the Bishops in London. In these examinations he had expressly approved of what are called the 'Wings,' and at this period he had never communicated with Doctor Doyle.

Letters on the State of Ireland by 'J. K. L.' had been published so early as the middle of February. These letters were generally supposed to have been written by Dr. Doyle, and at all events they have received his explicit sanction. Now the author of them had expressly condemned the measures in question, and surely this fact might have reminded Mr. O'Connell that his approval could not have been founded on Dr. Doyle's opinions.

Soon after Dr. Doyle's arrival in London, he was himself examined before the Committees of both Lords and Commons. It is unnecessary to repeat the particulars of his evidence, but most certainly neither then, nor at any other time, in private or public, did he give the plan for pensioning the Clergy his sanction or approbation.

These facts, Sir, appear to me perfectly conclusive, as far as Doctor Doyle is concerned. I do believe that the same statement could



be made on the part of Dr. Murray, but, as I have already promised, I shall strictly confine myself to what I can assert of my own knowledge.

The second statement of Mr. O'Connell, to which I am compelled to refer, is contained in the latter part of his speech. He says of the Bishops, 'they may have been taken by surprise. The purity of their own motives and the consciousness of their own integrity may have exposed them to the artifices of designing persons, but the period will never again arrive when they will be unprepared for any measure which the Government may propose.' The obvious inference to be drawn from this statement is, that in (Mr. O'Connell's opinion) the Bishops were duped by the Government, and were thereby led to approve of what they have otherwise condemned. This, Sir, I must deny altogether. Some persons may have been deceived, but most certainly Dr. Doyle was not one of them. The opinions which he entertained of the *generosity and good faith* of the Government were such as to prevent him from being entrapped by any snare that might be laid for him and his brethren.—During his residence in England he frequently wrote to his friends in the country, and were it proper to produce his letters, it would be seen that he was neither circumvented nor deceived; *the very contrary* would be very clearly demonstrated.

So far, Sir, as Mr. O'Connell's speech is concerned, I have now done with this painful subject. The character of Dr. Doyle stands on the very highest point of estimation, both here and in England. Could it, however, be supposed that in *public* he would condemn certain measures, and in *private* give his sanction to Mr. O'Connell's support of them, his consistency, nay, his honesty, would appear extremely doubtful. I am sure that, if Mr. O'Connell had looked at the matter in this light, he would have antici-

pated my remarks, by coming forward to explain his meaning. The opinion of so very humble an individual as I am can be of no importance to any one, but least of all to Mr. O'Connell, whose country has repeatedly expressed her gratitude for his unwearied zeal and important services. I may, however, be permitted to say, that while I endeavour to correct in his speech what appears to me to be an error, I still feel in his regard the same sentiments of admiration and gratitude which every honest man, who loves his country, must feel for one of her best and most powerful friends.

As to the opinion of Dr. Doyle on the Bill for pensioning the Clergy, and the Bill for disfranchising the Freeholders, a few words may not be unnecessary; and, as I have repeatedly heard him give expression to his sentiments on these subjects, I can be sure of giving them with perfect accuracy. His opinion on the first point is at present, and always has been, the same; he never approved of such a provision for the Clergy—he did, and he does strongly disapprove of it in any shape. His anxious wish for the Emancipation of the Catholics, and the peace of the country, could alone have induced him to acquiesce in some such arrangement; but this reluctant acquiescence would not have been given to any provision which could trench in the slightest degree on the liberties of the Irish Church, or the independence of her Prelacy and Priesthood. During his examination before the Parliamentary Committees, he perceived clearly that the opponents of Catholic Emancipation would have been delighted if he had exhibited an *unqualified* opposition to both the 'Wings'—they would have then thrown upon him all the odium attached to the rejection of Emancipation. He therefore extricated himself from the necessity of giving any evidence with regard to the Forty-shilling Free-

holders, because, if he had expressed his opinion, it should have been opposed to the opinions of Mr. Blake and Mr. O'Connell. His sentiments, however, on this subject, could not possibly be mistaken; the letters of J. K. L. afforded ample testimony of his feelings on this point; and I most positively assert that his opinions are at present and always have been the same as those expressed in the letters of J. K. L.

With regard to the legal provision for the Clergy, Dr. Doyle also perceived that if he had entered an unqualified protest against it, he would place himself in direct opposition, not only to the Catholic gentlemen who had previously approved of it in their evidence, but also to many of our parliamentary friends. Nay, more,—he would have rendered himself responsible in the eyes of the country for the failure of the general measure—a failure which the opponents of the Catholics, and the Catholics themselves, and many of their friends in Parliament, would have united in imputing to Dr. Doyle's opposition. He, therefore, yielded a very reluctant assent to the measure, provided always that it would in no degree interfere with the rights of his church or the freedom of his country. His opinion on this subject is most clearly expressed in the evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons, on the 16th and 18th of March.

Having given his reluctant acquiescence, Dr. Doyle was in the next place anxious that the provision for the Clergy should not be given as a *Regium donum*, or made to depend on an annual vote of the House of Commons, but that it should be a permanent provision established by law. This was the form in which it was introduced, and in order to leave the Bishops and Clergy full time to consider the details of the measure, the *principle alone* of the provision was embodied in a single resolution, and all the details were left to be arranged between the Government and

the Clergy. So far the views of Dr. Doyle were accomplished, and in all this it requires no ordinary sagacity to discover in what manner he has been either entrapped or deluded. He had no wish ever to treat with any one connected with the Government; but on the other hand I am convinced that (with God's help) he has no reason to fear that he will be ever betrayed into any measure inconsistent with the civil and religious principles which he always professed.

As to Dr. Doyle himself, his most intimate friends are well aware that even should he withhold his opposition from an arrangement that would leave his religion untouched, and which would meet the approbation of the other Prelates, still for his own individual part, he would rather live by the labour of his hands, than by any provision that would not come from the people, to whom he is appointed to administer the goods of Christ. On this point his sworn evidence gives the strongest corroboration to his well known opinions.

It is a matter of deep regret to all the friends of Ireland, and to Dr. Doyle in particular, that a difference of opinion on these subjects should have presented even the appearance of disunion among the Catholics of Ireland. As an Irishman, attached to constitutional liberty, Dr. Doyle is opposed to any limitation of the Elective Franchise, but in this opinion he differs from some of his most esteemed friends, and there is no reason why they should cease to be united. If the Government were sincere, they would first emancipate the Catholics, and *then* treat about raising the qualifications of Electors. But there is no reason to hope for this—for as long as we are so silly as to dispute on this subject, the Government would be even more silly if they removed the 'bone of contention.'

Neither is there any cause why the Catholic Laity should disturb themselves about the provision for their

Clergy. Let them leave the Government to treat with the Bishops, if indeed the former have any wish to do so, which I very much doubt. The treaty cannot be concluded in secret, and the Clergy cannot be compelled to adopt it. Were the Bishops inclined to barter the rights and liberties of their religion and country for the Mammon of iniquity, they would be the basest and vilest of men. But no matter; even were it possible for them to become so degraded, it is not possible for them to accomplish their purpose without affording ample time to canvass and oppose their proceedings. Let the Catholics then attend to the *one* thing necessary—the attainment of their rights. Let them petition against injustice—let them call loudly for the repeal of the Penal Laws—but let them not strengthen the hands of their opponents, nor weaken the efforts of their friends, by irrelevant discussions—above all, let them not diminish the force with which their cause is hourly advancing, by loading its progress with useless and extraneous incumbrances.

I am aware, Sir, that I owe an apology to you and to your readers, for the length of this letter. I can only offer the *truth* as my best excuse. I did think (and others, much wiser than I can hope to be, thought with me,) that some expressions of Mr. O'Connell might be used by our opponents to darken the unsullied character of two most eminent Prelates—two most powerful supporters of their country. As my residence in this town, and my profession as a Clergyman, gave me peculiar opportunities of knowing Dr. Doyle's sentiments, I felt that (having power to do so,) I was called upon by a solemn duty to have his conduct properly understood. In effecting this I did not, in the slightest degree, intend to attach the slightest blame to any other person; and I again repeat, that Mr. O'Connell has not a warmer admirer, or a more sin-

cere friend, than the writer of this letter.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c. &c.

WM. KINSELLA.

Friday, July 15, 1825.

P. S. The preceding Letter was written on yesterday; but I thought it more prudent not to send it until I should have read your Paper, which arrived this morning. I did hope that something might possibly have occurred at the Aggregate Meeting, which would have spared me the painful necessity of giving a public explanation of Dr. Doyle's conduct and opinions. Though much was done which must give sincere joy to every honest man, yet I saw nothing to supersede the necessity of this letter, and I still with sincere regret feel myself compelled to send it to you for insertion.

---

MR. O'CONNELL'S ANSWER TO MR.  
KINSELLA'S FIRST LETTER.

*To the Editor of the Dublin Morning Register.*

Merrion Square, 23 July, 1825.

SIR—I have been twenty-three years engaged in the Catholic cause. During that long period many things have occurred calculated to mortify, and some to disgust me. But, either the natural elasticity of my animal spirits, or some other cause, prevented me from being affected by any of the attacks, whether open or insidious, made upon me. I must, however, acknowledge that my period of apathy has terminated. I have at length felt with sensitiveness all the bitterness of reproach—and, in the spirit, perhaps, of humiliated pride and mortified vanity, I sit down to reply to a strange, and, I will add, most unnecessary public assault, made on me by a very respectable Clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Kinsella, of Carlow College.

Until I saw this letter, I never felt a sensation of regret at the portion of my time and property which has

been devoted to Catholic affairs. It is natural that I should overrate the value of that time, and be too sensible of the amount of such property. Yet, till I saw this letter, I never felt regret for the one or the other. But that letter gave rise to feelings of a nature calculated, at least, to make me recollect that one of the most celebrated of Roman patriots died, exclaiming that "public virtue was but a name." And if this sentiment obtruded itself on a great man, why should not so useless and obscure an individual as myself feel a similar pang, when unnecessarily assailed from a quarter to which I would have fondly looked for friendship, for protection, for patronage?

The occasion of which the Rev. Mr. Kinsella availed himself to "rush into print" against me was this—A meeting had been called of St. Audcon's parish, nominally, to petition Parliament, just three days after Parliament had risen!!! In that respect, it was a kind of "privateering after the war;" but its real object might have been, what Mr. Kinsella says it was.—His words are, "Now, Sir, at the meeting in Bridge-street, the whole question at issue was, the propriety of Mr. O'Connell's conduct in approving of the Bill for increasing the qualification of the Electors, and of the proposed plan for pensioning the Clergy."

Perhaps so; perhaps that was the sole question at issue in Bridge-street. Yet such an object was strenuously denied by most of the adverse speakers there. They were—Lord love them—they were, they said, merely talking of abstract questions, unimportant to me. But I am apt to believe with the public, that the Rev. Mr. Kinsella is right. He may, besides, have private means of knowing the real sentiments of the movers of the Bridge-street Meeting which I have not; and at all events, he has lent the aid of his powerful talents and most respectable character, to forward the objects of those

who might have intended to "let off" that meeting at my head.

The cause of the Rev. Mr. Kinsella's letter is—the report of a speech made by me, in return for a vote of thanks passed to me by that Meeting.

I believe there is not a human being amongst the reading classes of society that is not quite aware of the gross inaccuracy with which speeches are reported in the public papers; such inaccuracy is familiar to a proverb—indeed it must be so. How is it possible for a writer to follow the rapid progress of speech, or to seize with minuteness the arrow flight of another person's ideas? It is, in truth, surprising, that even so much can be done in this way as is done, to give any notion of an unpremeditated speech. But where there is any subject of a delicate nature, or any thing like precision required, nobody, I believe, thinks of fastening the terms of a reported speech on the speaker, without at least a previous inquiry.

With respect to the speech in question, it was given in a paper (*The Morning Register*) which, in my opinion, employs the best reporters in this country. And I say this the more readily, because I am bound to add that this report was singularly inaccurate—it was inaccurate beyond the usual inaccuracy of newspaper reports. I can account for this circumstance by my having spoken from the gallery at a great distance from the reporters, who were seated near the altar railing.

I recollect having had occasion the next day, in a conversation with a respectable gentleman, to remark on the gross misstatement made in that report. The friend to whom I allude said, that it was likely that either Dr. Murray or Dr. Doyle would write to me to know if I could have made such assertions respecting them. My answer was, that I thought it very improbable they would take that trouble, as they both knew how little reliance was to be placed on

such reports, and how utterly incapable I was of giving utterance to the untruths respecting them which the newspapers attributed to me.

Little did I imagine at that time, that, without any previous inquiry, I should be treated in print as the asserter of falsehood, and proved historically and chronologically to be a liar, by a respectable and respected Catholic Clergyman.

I did not imagine it possible that there existed any person capable of thinking, that, in addition to my other labours, I am bound to volunteer to watch over the press; to correct its misstatements, and to set myself right whenever it misrepresents me wilfully or by mistake. If this be expected of me, I must confess I am totally unable to do it.

I would rather suffer any infliction than be driven into constant byebattles with newspaper Reporters. Besides, if I were of my own motion to correct them in one instance, I would thereby incur the liability of a tacit admission of the accuracy of all which I did not correct. I have, therefore, constantly in my speeches, and repeatedly in print, and more than once, in the columns of *The Morning Register*, disclaimed any responsibility for any publication, not signed with my name.

If any evil could occur from my inattention to the Reporters, the remedy is the most easy and simple in the world. It consists in an application, either verbal or written, to myself. If the Rev. Mr. Kinsella condescended to write to me one line, before he wrote a long letter to the *Dublin Evening Post*, all would have been set right, and I would have authorized him to publish, or I myself would, in one moment, at his request, have published such a correction of the Report, as would have certainly rendered it unnecessary, as well, indeed, as impossible, for him to brand me, amidst honied accents of undeserved praise, with the foul names of liar and calumniator.

That the Report contained a falsehood was perfectly clear. How have

I deserved that he should fix it upon me, without an inquiry? Would not courtesy have required, that an enemy should be asked, whether he really was guilty, before his guilt was pronounced certain? Alas! my vanity and foolish pride made me think I deserved more than courtesy. It made me believe, that before a Catholic Clergyman joined in print, the Bridge-street gang, as they have been called, and the minor calumniators, in assailing me, he would not put my certain conviction on the mere hazard of my contradicting or not, newspaper reporters; but would give himself first the kind and considerate trouble of asking me how the fact really was.

Nay, if I had really used the word attributed to me, I would have expected the condescension of a private expostulation; and the opportunity of myself publicly retracting, before I was met in hostile array, by a Gentleman, whose sacred character and station make his hostility justly appear to be of itself an absolute condemnation.

Let me not be mistaken; let me not be supposed to utter reproaches; but I have a right, in the bitterness of sorrow, to complain, that at such a period as the present, those who, no matter from what motives, seek to destroy that unanimity, on which mainly our chance of success depends, should be able to wield the name, and use the labours of so truly excellent a person as the Rev. Mr. Kinsella against me, and against those who, with me, are struggling to keep our forces together for the day of constitutional battle against the common enemy.

Had the Rev. Gentleman, on reading the report in question, the kindness towards me, and the condescension to write to me, I tell you, Mr. Editor, what would have been my reply.

First—I should have expressed my sincere pleasure, at becoming the correspondent of a gentleman, to whom, as a scholar and a divine, the Catholics are so much indebted,



during the memorable, and to him, as well as to the Catholic cause, most honourable Bible battle in Carlow.

Secondly—I would have expressed, as I now cheerfully express, my respectful affection, as well as my profound veneration, for the dignified Prelates to whom allusion is made, and declared, that I was delighted to have a *legitimate* opportunity to do away any possible suspicion that I would have spoken of either of them in any way calculated to derogate from their high and venerated characters. I would have respectfully and gratefully thanked the Rev. Mr. Kinsella for giving me that opportunity.

Thirdly—I would have distinctly disclaimed the accuracy of the report. I would have taken up both the passages quoted in his letter, and shown him, in detail, that they contained most gross mistakes of my meaning.

I should have proceeded in these, or similar words:—The second passage you have quoted, Reverend Sir, demands my attention in the first instance. It is this—I use your own words—“He says of the Bishops, they may have been taken by surprise. The purity of their own motives, and the consciousness of their own integrity, may have exposed them to the artifices of designing persons, but the period will never again arrive when they will be unprepared for any measure the Government may propose.”

I did use language sufficiently similar to this passage, to enable me to avow the passage itself. But I think you will be “*taken by surprise*” when you hear the simple fact, that I was speaking, not of the year 1825, but of the year 1799—not of his Grace Dr. Murray, or the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, but of Prelates many, nay, most of whom are long since dead—not, in short, of the measure of making a provision for the Catholic Clergy, but of the Veto.

The matter occurred thus: One of the speakers against “the wings”

actually went the length of arguing that a State provision for our Clergy, in the event of Emancipation, was a branch of the Veto. He said that the Laity should watch over the subject, as the Prelates had before been induced, at one time, to sanction the Veto.

It was as a reply to that remark, that I applied the sentiment in question. I threw some ridicule on the assertion of there being a connexion between the two measures, and showed that, although in 1799 some of the Catholic Prelates had been deceived into a qualified assent of a portion of the Veto, yet, that from the character and roused vigilance of our present Prelates, there was no apprehension of any recurrence of mistake or surprise on that subject.

I then spoke, as I think, of the existing class of Catholic Prelates in Ireland. I poured out my heart: in the expression of the sentiments I entertain, of all the Prelates who attended in London in the present year, and of the two Prelates in question, I spoke, as every Catholic must speak, in terms of the most unmixt and unmitigated approbation. I relied upon their unblemished characters, as the surest and strongest proof that any measure to which they had given an assent, reluctant or otherwise, could not be Vetoistical. I asserted that, if it were Vetoistical, no earthly consideration could have induced them, nor any human terrors could compel them, to assent to the measure. I alluded to the evidence of Doctor Doyle, as conclusive against such an unworthy supposition.

I was thus naturally led to the part I took in the details of the “provision” for the Catholic Clergy. I did then assert, and I repeat the assertion, “that in all the communications I had with the persons who patronized that provision, I did not do any thing, or assent to any one detail, which had not the assent, and, as such, the sanction, of the revered Prelates in question.” In this assertion, my allusion was to the

details constituting *the principle* justly put forward by the Rev. Mr. Kinsella, on behalf of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, namely, "that it was not to be a *Regium donum*, or made to depend on an annual vote of the House of Commons," but "that it should be a permanent provision established by law."

These details, Rev. Sir, were what I alluded to in that part of my speech which gave rise to the first passage you quote. Inaccurate as the report is, yet it does not, as I respectfully submit, bear out the inference you draw from it. There certainly is not a word in that passage respecting "the freehold wing," and whatever there be to justify your inference extending it to the "freehold wing," there certainly was nothing in my speech to justify the reporter in that respect.

I solemnly declare that I did not say one word connecting, directly or indirectly, the name of any Catholic Prelate, or the opinion of any Catholic Prelate, with my support of (if you choose to call it *support*), or, as I should say, my *acquiescence* in "the freehold wing."

I could not have said it with respect to Dr. Murray or Dr. Doyle, without being guilty of what you, Rev. Sir, really attribute to me—namely, a foolish and absurd falsehood.

With respect to his Grace the Archbishop, I do not know what his opinion may be with regard to this wing—or whether he has any opinions at all on the subject. If he have, I certainly respect them—but I never heard him utter them. Nay, if I had asked him his opinion on "the Freehold Bill," I really believe his reply would consist in a smile, and a repetition of my question—"And pray what is your own opinion?"

As to the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, I was quite aware that his published sentiments were very different from mine. I was also aware that he avoided, whilst in London, any interference with that subject. He

seemed to consider it as foreign from the duties which he had to perform there.—and, at all events, I never consulted him on this topic—I considered our opinions as opposite—and, whilst on every thing connected with religion I should pay the most deferential and unqualified respect for his judgment, I certainly would, and do respectfully differ from him on the 40s. freehold system in Ireland. I have not the foolish vanity to compare my mental faculties to his, but I have had professional and other opportunities to watch the system in all its workings, and to ascertain facts relating to it with which Dr. Doyle is probably unacquainted.

But, under these circumstances, nothing could be further from my mind than to allege that either Dr. Murray or Dr. Doyle had given any sanction to my opinions on the "freehold wing."

I have, Reverend Sir, only further to assure you, that I never expressed any "horror" at the "freehold wing," or at the "provision wing." For my opinions on the former I stood and stand on my own judgment. For my acquiescence in "*the principle*" of the latter, I did and do claim the benefit of the assent to that principle given by Catholic Prelates of the first and highest estimation.

That principle presupposes Emancipation. It presupposes a paternal and fostering government—not ruling for the protection of a faction, but governing for the strength and security of all the people.

The mode in which such a paternal government should be cherished by the Irish people, is indeed widely different from any thing we have hitherto experienced.

I cannot, Rev. Sir, conclude without assuring you, that I concur with those who think that our cause was retarded, not advanced, by "the wings," and to express my determination not to consent in future to connect the fate or fortunes of the Catholic cause, with any extraneous

measures whatsoever. Our friends cannot blame a determination which experience justifies—our enemies cannot calumniate a determination which their own conduct has sanctioned.

Such, Mr. Editor, would have been my reply to the private letter of the Rev. Mr. Kinsella. If it be any pleasure to him to know that he has grieved and humiliated me, I give him the advantage of knowing the fact. But, although goaded by more painful feelings than I ever before experienced, I trust I have not said one word inconsistent with the reverence I bear to his sacred functions, and the respect I entertain for his personal and individual character.

I have the honour to be, your very obedient Servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

Since I wrote the greater part of the above letter, I have seen my friend Cobbett's last publication. What a strange creature it is! If I had leisure, I think I would laugh a little at him by way of reply; I wish he would deprive me of my 'Leadership' amongst the Catholics. I assure him it is a very troublesome commodity; but I cannot lose it on allegations, which happen to have the poetical quality of invention, or the less amiable one of complete distortion.

#### MR. KINSELLA'S SECOND LETTER.

*Carlton, July 30, 1825.*

SIR,—I regret that my absence from this place for some days has prevented me from having sooner taken notice of the letter of Mr. O'Connell, which appeared in your Paper of last Saturday. As, however, the observations which I have to offer, regard principally my own conduct, the delay of a few days can be of little importance.

Mr. O'Connell seems to think that I have had some communica-

tion with the Gentlemen who called the Meeting of St. Audeon's Parish. In this he is very much mistaken; I have the honour of knowing but *one* of these Gentlemen, and with that respected individual I have had no communication during the last six months.

Mr. O'Connell has misunderstood what I said about his conduct having formed the whole question at issue in Bridge-street. My meaning was, that the propriety of his support to the "wings" was the principal topic of discussion at the Meeting. As to the object of the Gentlemen who called the Meeting, I knew nothing whatever of it, except what I learned from the Public Papers.

Mr. O'Connell seems to say that I branded him as a liar and a calumniator. I am much surprised that he could think so. I repeatedly stated in my letter, that I considered his assertions to have arisen from some mistake, and it now appears that the mistake had originated with the reporters. I also expressed my conviction that he would, himself, have corrected the mistake, if he had adverted to the consequences; and I shall now add, that he is one of the last men in Ireland, that I would suspect of a wilful falsehood.

As to the general inaccuracy of reporters, I was not so well acquainted with it as Mr. O'Connell seems to be; I, however, employed the only means in my power of procuring a correct report, by consulting four different newspapers.

As to my reason for writing, it is perfectly plain. If the Irish public alone were concerned, I should have remained silent; but it is too well known that Dr. Doyle's character for consistency and sincerity has been assailed in England, even within the walls of the Imperial Parliament; and there can be no manner of doubt, that there are men of high station who would have gloated with delight, were they able to convict him of inconsistency and insincerity on such high authority as that of Mr. O'Connell. Under these cir-

circumstances, I consulted but two persons, but these were Gentlemen of such distinguished patriotism and such well-known prudence, that if it were proper to mention their names, Mr. O'Connell himself would allow that I could not have chosen better advisers. They considered it necessary for some person to call for an explanation, and at their request I wrote my letter.

To these Gentlemen I, myself, suggested the propriety of a private application to Mr. O'Connell. They were decidedly of opinion that (for reasons which it is not necessary to mention) it would be inexpedient to delay an explanation which was *immediately* necessary. I do not, Sir, wish to shelter myself under the protection of their advice; for, in point of fact, after having heard their reasons, I agreed perfectly with their opinion. As to "rushing into print," of which Mr. O'Connell accuses me, the postscript to my letter might have undeceived him. He would there have learned, that I kept back my letter until I could see your report of the Aggregate Meeting, because I hoped that an interval of some days might have produced such an explanation as would have saved me the very painful duty of writing.

I now come to the great object which induced me to write this letter: Mr. O'Connell has shown that the whole mistake arose from the inaccuracy of the reporters; and I feel that I am only doing bare justice, by declaring, that his explanation is perfectly satisfactory.

I regret *very sincerely* that my letter should have given so much pain to Mr. O'Connell. I cannot, however, regret having written the letter, because I thought it my duty to do so; most certainly, however, I did not wish to have caused him a moment's uneasiness.

Mr. O'Connell had paid me compliments which I do not deserve; but he speaks of 'honied accents of undeserved praise,' as if I were not sincere in expressing my opinion of his high talents and eminent services.

It is painful to be obliged to speak of my own character; but I must say, that I am incapable of giving praise unless where I believe it to be due; and if I did not think Mr. O'Connell to be a man of the most undoubted integrity, I should never have said that he was so.—I am, Sir, yours,  
W. KINSELLA.

I have no room for comment.

It is, indeed, nearly unnecessary; for, does not the equivocation, does not the shocking shuffling, does not the *falseness* (for that is the word) show themselves in every line of this "leader's" most mean and most pitiful attempt at a defence of his conduct? What! *four reports, in four different newspapers, and all erroneous!* What! "Counsellor" BRIC, who was *one of the reporters*, give an erroneous report too! The deuce take "Counsellor" BRIC, then, I say, and hang all these nasty Dublin newspapers, for thus misrepresenting poor modest Mr. O'CONNELL. But, I have heard *two things*, and I believe them both: first, a most respectable gentleman from Dublin, has told me, that HE WAS IN THE CHAPEL OF ST. AUDEON, AND HEARD MR. O'CONNELL UTTER THE WORDS, OR WORDS TO FULLY THAT AMOUNT; second, I have heard, that "Counsellor" BRIC showed Mr. O'CONNELL the report *before*

it was published. I believe both these; and, if the latter be not correct, Mr. O'CONNELL can only "laugh," when he have the "leisure;" for he will, I think, not venture on a contradiction. However, this is of no consequence; for, had not Mr. O'CONNELL read the report of his speech, in the newspapers? If false, had he not had plenty of time to correct it? What! Was Dr. DOYLE to be thus blackened in a report, which had already been reprinted in England, and circulated all over Ireland, and was he to hold his tongue, and content himself with a private application to Mr. O'CONNELL! This shows to what length vanity will push a man.

But, there is enough. It is now all so plain, that no man in his senses can fail to understand every part of it. I have only to add, that, if you be still determined to follow at the heels of this "leader," it will, at least, be prudent to keep him all to yourselves, for that, here, his very name, would throw contempt and ridicule on your cause; but, that, act as you may in this respect, I shall always do to obtain you justice, every thing in the power of your faithful Friend,

WM. COBBETT.

### MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending July 30.

Per Quarter.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat ..	67	10	Oats ....	25	3
Rye ....	41	5	Beans ...	41	8
Barley ..	35	8	Peas ....	41	5

Total Quantity of Corn returned as Sold in the Maritime Districts, for the Week ended July 30.

	Qrs.		Qrs.
Wheat ..	30,525	Oats ...	20,493
Rye ....	167	Beans ...	3,796
Barley ..	4,347	Peas ....	587

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, July 30.

	Qrs.	£.	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat ..	3,102	for	17,585	11	7	Average, 68	11
Barley ..	1,893	...	3,490	0	9	...	36 10
Oats ..	11,425	...	15,808	10	6	...	27 9
Rye ....	11	...	18	15	0	...	34 1
Beans ..	2,853	...	6,303	7	11	...	44 2
Peas ....	485	...	1,022	1	4	...	43 9

Friday, Aug. 5.—This week the supplies of all sorts of Corn are small. Wheat has sold much more readily than of late, but prices cannot be quoted higher. Barley, Beans, and Pease remain as last reported. Fresh Oats sell freely, at rather higher prices, but stale parcels go off heavily.

Monday, August 8.—The arrivals of all sorts of Grain last week were small, except of Oats from Ireland, of which there was a considerable quantity. This morning the fresh supplies of Wheat, Barley, Beans, and Pease, from Essex, Kent, and Suffolk, are again short. There are only a few vessels fresh up from the North with Oats, but several more from Ireland with the same grain. Prime samples of Wheat are scarce, and have obtained 1s. to 2s. per qr. advance on the terms of this day se'nnight; other sorts are not dearer, and the trade has not been so brisk as on Friday last, notwithstanding the showery weather.



Barley, for malting, is 1s. per qr. dearer, other sorts are still dull. The sale of Beans is not so free as last Monday, and barely support that day's currency. New Boiling Pease have obtained from 52s. to 56s., but old samples are unaltered in value. Grey Pease are dearer. Oats, of good quality, are 1s. per quarter higher, but the sale of Irish Oats has been slow to-day, so that the trade upon the whole cannot be reported so brisk as last week. In the Flour trade there is not much doing.

Account of Wheat, &c. arrived in the Port of London, from Aug. 1 to Aug. 6, both inclusive.

Qrs.		Qrs.	
Wheat .. 5,008	Tares ....	—	—
Barley .. 1,303	Linseed ..	1,050	—
Malt .... 1,995	Rapeseed ..	251	—
Oats .... 17,480	Brank ..	32	—
Beans ... 1,755	Mustard ..	—	—
Flour .... 5,015	Flax ....	—	—
Rye .... —	Hemp ...	—	—
Pease .... 656	Seeds ...	347	—
Foreign.—Wheat, 4,775; Oats, 315 qrs.			

#### HOPS.

Price of Hops per Cwt. in the Borough.

Monday, Aug. 8.—The market is very steady: accounts state a partial improvement, though the late high wind has done much damage, the result of which will in a few days be better estimated. It is thought one-fourth of the burr is destroyed. Currency same as last week; duty 22,000*l.* to 24,000*l.*

Maidstone, Aug. 6. — Our Hop Plantations are generally called in rather an improving state, particularly those grounds with strong Bines and most forward, as the young branches and Burr look healthy, and seem to be clean, the vermin being considered quite dead, and should the present month continue favourable, they may yet do a little; many grounds, on the other hand, still continue as bad as ever.

Worcester, Aug. 2.—On Saturday 278 pockets were weighed, chiefly old. The market was heavy. In a large portion of our plantation much improvement has taken place during the last week; there are, however, situations where very few Hops will be produced.

Monday, Aug. 8.—The arrivals from Ireland last week were 4003 firkins of Butter, and 1375 bales of Bacon; and from Foreign Ports, 5,478 casks of Butter.

Price of Bread.—The price of the 4lb. Loaf is stated at 10½*d.* by the full-priced Bakers.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, August 8.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef .....	4	4	to	4 10
Mutton ...	4	6	—	5 2
Veal .....	5	0	—	6 0
Pork .....	5	6	—	6 0
Lamb .....	5	4	—	5 10
Beasts ... 2,963	Sheep ..	23,870		
Calves ... 305	Pigs ...	116		

NEWGATE, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef .....	3	2	to	4 2
Mutton ...	3	8	—	5 0
Veal .....	3	8	—	5 6
Pork .....	4	4	—	6 0
Lamb .....	4	8	—	5 8

LEADENHALL, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef .....	3	6	to	4 2
Mutton ...	4	0	—	5 0
Veal .....	4	0	—	5 8
Pork .....	4	8	—	6 0
Lamb .....	4	6	—	6 0

COAL MARKET, August 5.

*Ships at Market. Ships sold. Price.*

1½ Newcastle..	1	32s. 6d.	to	34s. 9d.
Sunderland..	—	0s. 0d.	—	0s. 0d.

## POTATOES.

## SPITALFIELDS.—per Cwt.

Ware.....	4	0	to	7	0
Middlings.....	2	6	—	3	6
Chats.....	2	3	—	2	6
Common Red..	0	0	—	0	0

## BOROUGH.—per Cwt.

Ware.....	4	6	to	7	6
Middlings.....	3	0	—	4	0
Chats.....	2	0	—	2	3
Common Red..	0	0	—	0	0

## HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay....	60s.	to	95s.
Straw....	36s.	to	44s.
Clover..	80s.	to	118s.
St. James's.—Hay....	70s.	to	95s.
Straw...31s.	to	46s.	
Clover..96s.	to	115s.	
Whitechapel.—Hay....	70s.	to	100s.
Straw...38s.	to	48s.	
Clover..84s.	to	115s.	

## COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

*The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.*

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.		Beans.		Pease.	
	s.	to s. d.	s.	to s. d.	s.	to s. d.	s.	to s. d.	s.	to s. d.
Aylesbury .....	68	72 0	38	42 0	26	30 0	48	50 0	0	0 0
Banbury .....	56	66 8	46	50 0	28	34 0	48	53 4	0	0 0
Basingstoke ....	60	70 0	38	45 0	24	30 0	45	53 0	0	0 0
Bridport.....	64	72 0	36	37 4	26	26 6	48	0 0	0	0 0
Chelmsford.....	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Derby.....	68	74 0	0	0 0	27	31 0	48	52 0	0	0 0
Devizes.....	58	72 0	43	0 0	25	34 0	46	56 0	0	0 0
Dorchester.....	48	66 0	30	36 0	24	30 0	48	52 0	0	0 0
Exeter.....	60	76 0	40	48 0	21	25 4	0	0 0	0	0 0
Eye.....	60	70 0	34	44 0	36	40 0	24	30 0	36	40 0
Guildford.....	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Henley.....	60	82 0	40	50 0	26	34 0	50	55 0	46	50 0
Horncastle.....	58	68 0	36	42 0	22	27 0	44	48 0	0	0 0
Hungerford.....	64	76 0	36	44 0	26	33 0	44	60 0	0	0 0
Lewes.....	60	72 0	0	0 0	26	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Newbury.....	50	74 0	40	44 0	22	32 0	50	60 0	46	56 0
Newcastle.....	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Northampton....	66	70 0	45	47 0	24	30 0	45	48 0	42	43 0
Nottingham....	68	0 0	43	0 0	26	0 0	46	0 0	0	0 0
Reading.....	60	85 0	0	0 0	27	33 0	57	60 0	52	53 0
Stamford.....	66	71 0	48	50 0	25	31 0	45	49 0	0	0 0
Stowmarket....	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Swansea.....	72	0 0	40	0 0	20	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Truro.....	72	0 0	39	0 0	31	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Uxbridge.....	58	86 0	38	42 0	27	32 0	47	50 0	46	50 0
Warminster.....	54	70 0	31	48 0	26	30 0	46	54 0	0	0 0
Winchester.....	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Dalkeith*.....	32	37 0	29	32 0	19	22 0	19	20 0	19	22 0
Haddington*....	32	37 0	26	32 0	17	22 6	17	21 0	17	21 0

\* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the boll.—The Scotch boll for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The boll of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English quarter.